

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 —Alexandria, Viriginia 22313-1450 —www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,148	10/604,148 06/27/2003		Timothy S Hayes	BUR920020124US1	1147
28211	7590	07/14/2004		EXAM	INER
FREDERIO MCGINN &			THAI, LUAN C		
2568-A RIV			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 304	(a.) (b.)		2827		
ANNAPOL	is, MD 2	21401		DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/604,148	HAYES ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Luan Thai	2827
The MAILING DATE of this communication		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
,	his action is non-final.	tters prosecution as to the merits is
3) Since this application is in condition for allocation closed in accordance with the practice unde		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are objected to set of the complex of the co	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to a Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj the drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action of form P10-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. The sents have been received in priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-092) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB, Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/27/03&7/17/03.	Paper No	f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony et al (5,300,313).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Anthony et al. disclose a method comprising (Col. 1, lines 55-68, Col. 2, lines 1-3, Col. 4, lines 33-67): a) mounting the substrate in chemical vapor deposition apparatus so that at least one perforation exists in the plane of the substrate, monitoring the thickness of the layer formed in the perforation, depositing a

layer on the substrate by chemical vapor deposition; b) determining the relationship between the thickness of the layer formed in the perforation and the thickness of the layer formed on the substrate surface; and c) stopping deposition when the thickness of the layer formed on the perforation is consistent with the formation of a layer of the desired thickness on the surface.

Although Anthony et al. do not explicitly teach exactly the method steps as being claimed, Anthony et al.'s method steps a, b, c, and d would have been obvious to be considered as the claimed method steps of: 1) determining the actual film thickness of a film formed in the integrated circuit manufacturing process, 2) comparing the actual film profile with a desired film profile, and 3) if the actual film profile does not match the desired film profile, adjusting the integrated circuit manufacturing process to make the actual film profile match the desired film profile, respectively.

Regarding claim 3, Anthony et al. teach the steps of monitoring the thickness and determining the relationship between thicknesses of two layers that is considered as the profiles across cross sections of the layers.

Regarding claim 4, Anthony et al.'s step "c" is obviously considered as the claimed step of "repeating said determining, comparing, and adjusting processes for different cross-sections of said film".

Regarding claim 2, although Anthony et al. do not explicitly teach the layer profile comprising a range of acceptable layer profiles, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a layer with the thickness in a range of acceptable thickness because the range of the thickness is an art

Application/Control Number: 10/604,148

recognized variable of importance which is subject to routine experimentation and optimization.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 5-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. Claims 8-19 are allowed.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art taken either singly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest: a) the method step of determining said desired film profile by averaging previous formations of said film formed using the same integrated circuit manufacturing process, as recited in claim 5; and b) the step of plotting multiple thickness measures taken at regular intervals along a line crossing a film formed in said integrated circuit manufacturing process to produce an actual film profile of said film, as recited in claims 8 and 15; especially when these limitations are considered within the specific combination claimed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-1935. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:45 AM - 4:15 PM, Monday to Friday.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-1935. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:45 AM - 4:15 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Luan Thai

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2827

July 12, 2004